

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are presently pending in the application. Claims 12 and 13 are canceled. Claims 1, 9, 10, and 14 are amended. Claims 20-25 are new. Claims 1, 9, 10, 14, 20, and 23 are independent claims. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claims 2-6, 9, and 14-19 as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Although not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejections, claims 9 and 14 have been rewritten in independent form. Thus, claims 9, 14, and 15 are now in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7, 8, and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,843,309 to Kareem et al. (hereafter "Kareem"). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Synopsis of Kareem

Kareem is concerned with digital oscilloscopes. In such oscilloscopes, Kareem teaches that a waveform is monitored to detect trigger events when the signal crosses a predetermined level with a slope of preselected polarity (i.e. either negative or positive). A portion of the signal following each trigger event is displayed on screen. As disclosed in Kareem, each trigger point

results in a corresponding portion of the signal being displayed on screen, with the respective trigger points in the signal being aligned. See col. 3, lines 22-44; col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 7. Conventionally, a minimum period follows each trigger point before a subsequent trigger event can be detected, to allow for the display of a substantial part of the input signal on the screen (col. 1, lines 42-47). Kareem further discloses the possibility of the multiple signal portions being averaged (col. 3, lines 53-56).

Kareem Fails to Teach Every Claim Feature

Initially, Applicants point out that independent claims 1 and 10 recite measuring a parameter dependent upon the shape of the representation. Applicants submit that Kareem does not provide any teaching of measuring a shape parameter of a representation.

Claims 1 and 10 also recite that multiple versions of the signal are combined, each version comprising “overlapping parts of said signal.” These features are not disclosed in Kareem.

In Kareem, each trigger point and its associated displayed signal portion follow a preceding displayed signal portion. Accordingly, the signal portions are taken from successively spaced parts of the source signal. In other words, Kareem does not combine respective “versions” of the signal. Particularly, with reference to the aforementioned claim language, there are no versions in Kareem comprising “overlapping parts of said signal.” Instead, Kareem combines successive non-overlapping parts of the source signal. This is the standard way in which oscilloscopes operate (i.e., by sequentially displaying successive parts of the signal). Thus,

Kareem fails to teach or suggest combining overlapping parts of an input signal, as required by claims 1 and 10.

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable. Furthermore, Applicants submit that claims 7, 8, and 11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 10.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that newly added claims 20-25 do not add any new matter to the application.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is requested to contact Jason Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the application in an effort to expedite prosecution.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants hereby petition for an extension of two (2) month to November 6, 2005 in which to file a reply to the Office Action. The required fee of \$450.00 is enclosed herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 2, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant